arXiv:1703.01805v1 [stat.ME] 6 Mar 2017

Bayesian Estimation of Kendall's τ Using a Latent Normal Approach

Johnny van Doorn*
Department of Psychological Methods, University of Amsterdam

Alexander Ly
Department of Psychological Methods, University of Amsterdam

Maarten Marsman
Department of Psychological Methods, University of Amsterdam

Eric-Jan Wagenmakers
Department of Psychological Methods, University of Amsterdam

March 7, 2017

Abstract

The rank-based association between two variables can be modeled by introducing a latent normal level to ordinal data. We demonstrate how this approach yields Bayesian inference for Kendall's rank correlation coefficient, improving on a recent Bayesian solution from asymptotic properties of the test statistic.

Keywords: nonparametric inference, rank correlation

1 A Bayesian Framework for Kendall's τ

Kendall's τ is a popular rank-based correlation coefficient. Compared to Pearson's ρ, Kendall's τ is robust to outliers, invariant under monotonic transformations, and has an intuitive interpretation (Kendall and Gibbons, 1990). Let $X = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ and $Y = (y_1, ..., y_n)$ be two data vectors each containing ranked measurements of the same n units. For instance, x could be the rank ordered

*Correspondence may be addressed to Johnny van Doorn (E-mail: *J.B.vanDoorn@uva.nl*), Department of Psychological Methods, University of Amsterdam, Valckeniersstraat 59, 1018XE Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The authors acknowledge support from the European Science Foundation (ERC grant *283876*) and the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research.

scores on a math exam and y the rank ordered scores on a geography exam, for n test-takers. A *concordant* pair is then defined as a pair of subjects (i, j) where subject i has a higher score on x and y compared to subject j, whereas a *discordant* pair is defined as one where i scores higher on y, but j scores higher on x, or the other way around. Kendall's τ is defined as the difference between the number of concordant and discordant pairs, expressed as proportion of the total number of pairs:

$$\tau = \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}^{n} Q((x_i, y_i), (x_j, y_j))}{n(n-1)/2}, \tag{1}$$

where the denominator is the total number of pairs and Q is the concordance indicator function, which is defined by:

$$Q((x_i, y_i)(x_j, y_j)) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } (x_i - x_j)(y_i - y_j) < 0 \\ +1 & \text{if } (x_i - x_j)(y_i - y_j) > 0 \end{cases}. \tag{2}$$

The function returns -1 if a pair is discordant, and returns $+1$ if a pair is concordant. However, due to the nonparametric nature of Kendall's τ and the lack of a likelihood function for the data, Bayesian inference is not trivial.

An innovative method for overcoming this problem was proposed by Johnson (2005), and involves the modeling of the test statistic itself, rather than the data. This method has been applied to Kendall's τ by Yuan and Johnson (2008), and was recently developed by van Doorn et al. (ress). The inferential framework that follows from this work uses the limiting normal distribution of the test statistic T^* (Hotelling and Pabst, 1936; Noether, 1955), where

$$T^* = \tau \sqrt{\frac{9n(n-1)}{4n+10}}. \tag{3}$$

Under $\mathcal{H}_0$, this limiting normal distribution is the standard normal, whereas under $\mathcal{H}_1$, this distribution is specified with a non-centrality parameter Δ for the mean, and a sampling variance of 1.

However, the method - henceforth the *original asymptotic method* - might fall short on two counts. Firstly, the asymptotic assumptions only hold for sufficiently large n (i.e., $n \geq 20$, see van Doorn et al., ress). Secondly, the variance of the sampling distribution of the test statistic depends on the population value of Kendall's τ. For $\tau = 0$, the sampling variance equals 1, but as $|\tau| \to 1$, the variance decreases to 0 (Kendall and Gibbons, 1990; Hotelling and Pabst, 1936).

In the current article, we will explore two corrections that aim to improve Bayesian inference for Kendall's τ:

1. Within the asymptotic framework, the observed value of Kendall's τ can be used to set its sampling variance. We label this the *enhanced asymptotic method*.

2. Within a Bayesian latent normal framework, a latent level correlation is obtained and transformed to Kendall's τ. We label this the *latent normal method*.

2 Correction Using The Sample τ

A first correction to consider is to use the sample value of Kendall's τ, denoted τ_{obs}, to estimate the sampling variance of T^*, denoted $\sigma^2_{T^*}$. A convenient expression for the upper bound of $\sigma^2_{T^*}$ in terms of τ is given in Kendall and Gibbons (1990):

$$\sigma^2_{T^*} \leq \frac{2.5n(1-\tau^2)}{2n+5}. \tag{4}$$

Using τ_{obs} as an estimate of τ provides a somewhat crude approximation to the sampling distribution of T^*. However, compared to using $\sigma^2_{T^*} = 1$ as in the original asymptotic method, working with the upper bound will result in a more narrow posterior for cases where $\tau \neq 0$. However, the enhanced asymptotic method still suffers from the use of asymptotic assumptions about the sampling distribution and variance of the test statistic.

3 Correction Using The Latent Normal Approach

3.1 Latent Normal Models

Several latent variable models quantify the association between two ordinal variables. These methods often introduce a latent bivariate normal distribution to the ordinal variables, where the association between variables is modeled through a latent correlation. The observed rank data (x, y) can then be seen as the ordinal manifestations of the continuous latent variables (z^x, z^y) which have a bivariate normal distribution. Figure 1 offers a graphical representation of such a model. Using this methodology, the nonparametric problem of ordinal analysis is transformed to a parametric data augmentation problem.

The latent normal method was first introduced by Pearson (1900) as a means for modeling a 2×2 cross-classification table, and was further elaborated on by Pearson and Pearson (1922), who coined the term *polychoric correlation coefficient* (PCC) and accommodated analysis of $r \times s$ tables. A maximum likelihood approach for the PCC was developed by Olssen (1979); Olssen et al. (1982), and a Bayesian framework was introduced by Albert (1992). The PCC model is a special case of the ranked probit model where the number of categories is known. The method is also known as the Multivariate Normal Order Statistic model (MVNOS, Yao and Bockenholt, 1999; Yu, 2000).

Next to these models, there are the rank likelihood models (Pettitt, 1982; Alvo and Yu, 2014), which differ in the way the data augmentation is performed. The MVNOS models estimate both the latent scores and the latent boundaries separating the rank categories. In the rank likelihood models, these boundaries are determined by the latent scores that correspond to the adjacent rank scores. A detailed sampling algorithm is presented in the next section. Since both types of method yield highly similar posterior distributions (Hoff, 2007), the rank likelihood models are preferred in terms of computational and theoretical simplicity whenever one is not interested in the link function between the ordinal



Figure 1: A graphical model of the latent normal method. Here, x and y are observed rank data. The latent level is denoted with z^x and z^y, and $\rho_{z^x z^y}$ represents the latent correlation.

and latent levels. In the framework of estimating Kendall's τ, we therefore opt to use the rank likelihood methodology.

3.2 Posterior Distribution for the Latent Correlation

Using Bayes' rule, the joint posterior can be decomposed into likelihood and prior distributions in the following way:

$$P(z^x, z^y, \rho_{z^x,z^y}|x, y) \propto P(x, y|z^x, z^y) \times P(z^x, z^y|\rho_{z^x,z^y}) \times P(\rho_{z^x,z^y}). \tag{5}$$

The second factor is the bivariate normal distribution of the latent scores given the latent correlation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} z^x \\ z^y \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}\left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right]. \tag{6}$$

The factor $P(x, y|z^x, z^y)$ consists of a set of indicator functions that map the observed ranks to latent scores, such that the ordinal information is preserved. For the value z_i^x, this means that its range is truncated by the lower and upper thresholds that are respectively defined as:

$$a_i^x = \max_{j:x_j<x_i} \left(z_j^x\right) \tag{7}$$

$$b_i^x = \min_{j:x_j>x_i} \left(z_j^x\right). \tag{8}$$

The third factor is the prior distribution on the latent correlation. In the remainder of this article, the prior is specified by a uniform distribution on

$(-1, 1)$, but other options are available (e.g., Berger and Sun 2008; Ly et al. 2016).

The general Bayesian framework for estimating the latent correlation involves data augmentation through a Gibbs sampling algorithm (Geman and Geman, 1984), combined with a random walk Metropolis-Hastings sampling algorithm (Metropolis et al., 1953; Hastings, 1970) for the correlation coefficient itself. The general algorithm is as follows, at sampling time point s:

1. For each value of z_i^x, sample from a truncated normal distribution, where the lower threshold is a_i^x given in (7) and the upper threshold is b_i^x given in (8):

$$(z_i^x | z_{i'}^x, z_i^y, \rho_{z^x,z^y}) \sim N\left(z_i^y \rho_{z^x,z^y}, \sqrt{1 - \rho_{z^x,z^y}^2}\right) \delta_{a_i^x, b_i^x}$$

2. For each value of z_i^y, the sampling procedure is analogous to step 1.

3. Sample a new proposal for ρ_{z^x,z^y}, denoted ρ^*, from the asymptotic normal approximation to the sampling distribution of Fisher's z-transform of ρ (Fisher, 1915):

$$\tanh^{-1}(\rho^*) \sim N\left(\tanh^{-1}(\rho^{s-1}), \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-3)}}\right).$$

   The acceptance rate α is determined by the likelihood ratio of $(z^x, z^y|\rho^*)$ and $(z^x, z^y|\rho^{s-1})$, where each likelihood is determined by the bivariate normal distribution in (6):

$$\alpha = \min\left(1, \frac{P(z^x, z^y|\rho^*)}{P(z^x, z^y|\rho^{s-1})}\right).$$

Repeating the algorithm a sufficient number of times yields samples from the posterior distributions of z^x, z^y, and ρ_{z^x,z^y}.

3.3 Relation to Kendall's τ

With the posterior distribution for ρ_{z^x,z^y} in hand, the transition to the posterior distribution for Kendall's τ can be made using Greiner's relation (Greiner, 1909; Kruskal, 1958). This relation, defined as

$$\tau = G(\rho) = \frac{2}{\pi} \sin^{-1}(\rho) \tag{9}$$

$$\rho = G^{-1}(\tau) = \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) \tau, \tag{10}$$

enables the transformation of Pearson's ρ to Kendall's τ when the data follow a bivariate normal distribution.

Using Greiner's relation, the posterior distribution of Kendall's τ can be rewritten as follows:

$$P(\tau|x,y) \approx P(G(\rho)|x,y) = \int\int P(G(\rho)|z^x, z^y)P(z^x, z^y|x,y)dz^x dz^y.$$

Introducing the latent normal level to the observed variables enables the link between Pearson's ρ and Kendall's τ, and turns posterior inference for Kendall's τ into a parametric data augmentation problem that can be solved with the MCMC-methods described in the previous section. Thus, Greiner's relation can be applied to the posterior samples of ρ_{z^x,z^y} to yield posterior samples of τ.

Furthermore, the application of Greiner's relation in this manner implicitly alters the prior from a uniform distribution on the latent correlation to the following distribution on Kendall's τ:

$$p(\tau) = \frac{\pi}{4}\cos\left(\frac{\pi\tau}{2}\right), \tau \in (-1, 1). \tag{11}$$

Consequently, the prior on Kendall's τ using this method is identical to the prior distribution used in the asymptotic approaches from van Doorn et al. (ress).

4 Results: Simulation Study

The performance of the original asymptotic method, the enhanced asymptotic method, and the latent normal method was assessed with a simulation study. For four values of τ (0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.7) and three values of n (10, 20, 50), 10,000 datasets were generated from a bivariate normal model.[1] For each data set, a posterior distribution was obtained using the three methods and the population value of τ was estimated using the posterior median. Per combination of n and τ, this resulted in 10,000 posterior distributions. For an overall view of each method's performance, Figure 2 shows the quantile averaged posterior distributions, along with a vertical line indicating the population value of τ. The quantile averaged posteriors indicate no difference between the inferential methods under $\mathcal{H}_0$, which corroborates the assumption of $\sigma^2_{T^*} = 1$ when $\tau = 0$. However, the difference in methods becomes pronounced in the scenario where $n = 10$ and $\tau = 0.7$. Both asymptotic approaches show a degree of underestimation, and yield a relatively broad posterior distribution. In the panels where $\tau \neq 0$, the misspecification of the sampling variance also becomes clear, as it is overestimated and results in a wider posterior distribution compared to the latent normal method.

5 Discussion

This article has outlined two methods of improving the Bayesian inferential framework in cases where n is low and/or τ is high. Although an extension of

[1] R-code, plots, and further details are available online at `https://osf.io/u7jj9/`. Furthermore, various non-normal copula models were also tested and yielded similar results.

the asymptotic framework performs somewhat better than the original asymptotic framework in van Doorn et al. (ress), both are outperformed by the latent normal approach. Under $\mathcal{H}_0$, the methods do not differ from each other, underscoring the validity of the general framework. The enhanced asymptotic method naturally works faster and would be the preferred choice if both the sample size and correlation magnitude do not interfere with its underlying assumptions.

Finally, it is of note that the outlined procedure is relatively general and can be applied to a range of other nonparametric tests, such as Spearman's ρ and the Mann-Whitney U test.

References

Albert, J. H. (1992). Bayesian estimation of the polychoric correlation coefficient. *Journal of statistical computation and simulation*, 44:47–61.

Alvo, M. and Yu, P. (2014). *Statistical Methods for Ranking Data*. Frontiers in Probability and the Statistical Sciences. Springer New York, New York.

Berger, J. O. and Sun, D. (2008). Objective priors for the bivariate normal model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36:963–982.

Fisher, R. A. (1915). Frequency distribution of the values of the correlation coefficient in samples from an indefinitely large population. *Biometrika*, pages 507–521.

Geman, S. and Geman, D. (1984). Stoachastic relaxation, Gibbs distributions and the Bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 6:721–741.

Greiner, R. (1909). Über das Fehlersystem der Kollektivmasslehre. *Zeitschift für Mathematik und Physik*, pages 121–158.

Hastings, W. (1970). Monte Carlo samplings methods using Markov chains and their applications. *Biometrika*, 57:97–109.

Hoff, P. (2007). Extending the rank likelihood for semiparametric copula estimation. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 1:265–283.

Hotelling, H. and Pabst, M. (1936). Rank correlation and tests of significance involving no assumption of normality. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 7:29–43.

Johnson, V. E. (2005). Bayes factors based on test statistics. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 67:689–701.

Kendall, M. and Gibbons, J. D. (1990). *Rank Correlation Methods*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Kruskal, W. (1958). Ordinal measures of association. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 53:814–861.

Ly, A., Verhagen, A. J., and Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2016). Harold Jeffreys's default Bayes factor hypothesis tests: Explanation, extension, and application in psychology. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 72:19–32.

Metropolis, N., Rosenbluth, A., Rosenbluth, M., Teller, A., and Teller, E. (1953). Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 21:1087–1092.

Noether, G. E. (1955). On a theorem of Pitman. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 26:64–68.

Olssen, U. (1979). Maximum likelihood estimation of the polychoric correlation coefficient. *Psychometrika*, 44:443–460.

Olssen, U., Drasgow, F., and Dorans, N. (1982). The polyserial correlation coefficient. *Psychometrika*, 47:443–460.

Pearson, K. (1900). Mathematical contributions to the theory of evolution. vii. on the correlation of characters not quantitatively measurable. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 195(262-273):1–405.

Pearson, K. and Pearson, E. (1922). On polychoric coefficients of correlation. *Biometrika*, 14:127–156.

Pettitt, A. (1982). Inference for the linear model using a likelihood based on ranks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 44:234–243.

van Doorn, J., Ly, A., Marsman, M., and Wagenmakers, E.-J. (in press). Bayesian inference for kendall's rank correlation coefficient. *The American Statistician*.

Yao, G. and Bockenholt, U. (1999). Bayesian estimation of Thurstonian ranking models based on the Gibbs sampler. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 52:79–92.

Yu, P. (2000). Bayesian analysis of order–statistics models for ranking data. *Psychometrika*, 65:281–299.

Yuan, Y. and Johnson, V. E. (2008). Bayesian hypothesis tests using nonparametric statistics. *Statistica Sinica*, 18:1185–1200.



Figure 2: To illustrate the performance of the three methods, quantile averaged posterior distributions for several values of τ and n are shown. Each column corresponds to a value of n, and each row corresponds to a value of τ. The quantile averaged posterior distributions were obtained with 1,000 synthetic datasets per combination of n and τ. The vertical gray line indicates the population value of τ.